

TULSA METROPOLITAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of Meeting No. 1730
Wednesday, **January 25, 1989**, 1:30 p.m.
City Commission Room, Plaza Level, Tulsa Civic Center

MEMBERS PRESENT	MEMBERS ABSENT	STAFF PRESENT	OTHERS PRESENT
Carnes Coutant, Secretary Doherty Draughon Kempe, Chairman Paddock, 2nd Vice Chairman Parmele, 1st Vice Chairman Selph Wilson Woodard	Randle	Gardner Setters Stump	Linker, Legal Counsel

The notice and agenda of said meeting were posted in the Office of the City Auditor on Tuesday, January 24, 1989 at 10:46 a.m., as well as in the Reception Area of the INCOG offices.

After declaring a quorum present, First Vice Chairman Parmele called the meeting to order at 1:37 p.m.

MINUTES:

Approval of the Minutes of January 11, 1989, Meeting #1728:

On **MOTION** of **COUTANT**, the TMAPC voted **8-0-0** (Carnes, Coutant, Draughon, Paddock, Parmele, Selph, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Doherty, Kempe, Randle, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Minutes of January 11, 1989, Meeting #1728**.

REPORTS:

Committee Reports:

Mr. Carnes advised the **Comprehensive Plan Committee** met this date to review the FY 89-90 Capital Improvements Program. He stated the Committee recommendation would be presented at next week's meeting.

Mr. Paddock announced the **Rules & Regulations Committee** would be meeting next week to discuss the home occupation portion of the Zoning Code to consider making the home occupation exception non-transferrable to future occupants; and to discuss a "redevelopment or mini" PUD concept.

Committee Reports - Cont'd

Mr. Parmele announced the **Budget & Work Program Committee** had scheduled a meeting for February 15th for an update of the TMAPC Work Program projects. He mentioned the Committee would also need to start thinking about the FY 89-90 budget and work program.

Director's Report:

- a) Mr. Jerry Lasker invited the TMAPC members to a meeting on March 6th with the City Budget Department regarding an initial budget and project work-up for FY 89-90. Mr. Lasker also mentioned a meeting on February 8th with the Riverside Task Force who will provide an update on the development of projects along Riverside Drive.
- b) Report from Staff on the Highway Advertising Control Regulations, specifically Article IX-C, Section 4, item J, as relates to the affect, if any, on Z-6224 (Stokely Outdoor Advertising), reviewed and approved by the TMAPC on 12/28/88.

Comments & Discussion:

Mr. Gardner commented this review and investigation came about as a result of a telephone call from Mr. J.C. Jackson of the Oklahoma Department of Transportation, whose concern with Z-6224 involved its location adjacent to the Mingo Valley Expressway and, if approved, possible conflict with the Highway Advertising Control Regulations. Mr. Gardner summarized that Staff did not see any significant information in the regulations to impact the previous TMAPC zoning recommendation for approval.

Mr. Linker advised that the Legal Department has not been informed of any state law or federal statute that would prohibit the City from zoning a particular piece of property a particular classification. The above mentioned regulations, as adopted by the State, limit the ability to get a state permit for a sign; i.e., the State might deny a permit, even though the zoning has been properly obtained. He added that the regulation does not indicate that the City cannot rezone property. Therefore, the TMAPC's concern remained with the land use considerations.

First Vice-Chairman Parmele confirmed with Staff that the TMAPC action on the zoning request for Z-6224 was proper and the recommendation for approval would stand. In reply to Mr. Coutant, Mr. Gardner stated that the 12/28/88 minutes on this case would now be transmitted to the City Commission, along with a copy of the relevant Highway Advertising Control Regulations.

- c) Mr. Gardner stated that the special study on sexually-oriented businesses, as requested by the City Commission, has been completed. He advised that the findings of the study indicate that the recently adopted 500' spacing from schools, churches, residences, etc. would "meet the test" in terms in allowing this particular type of use and, at the same time, afforded protection for neighborhoods. He added

Director's Report - Cont'd

that the study also made two recommendations: redefinition of the term "adult bookstore" as used in the Zoning Code; and a three-year amortization period instead of the current five-year amortization period for the existing sexually-oriented businesses. Mr. Gardner suggested these matters be advertised for a March 1, 1989 TMAPC public hearing, with review by the Rules & Regulations Committee prior to that date.

CONTINUANCE(S):

PUD 159-12: Minor Amendment to Permit a Detached Accessory Building
6115 South Vancouver (Lot 36, Block 3, West Highlands IV)

On **MOTION** of **CARNES**, the TMAPC voted **10-0-0** (Carnes, Coutant, Doherty, Draughon, Kempe, Paddock, Parmele, Selph, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Randle, "absent") to **CONTINUE Consideration of PUD 159-12** until Wednesday, **February 1, 1989** at 1:30 p.m. in the City Commission Room, City Hall, Tulsa Civic Center.

ZONING PUBLIC HEARING:

Application No.: **Z-6227** Present Zoning: **RS-3**
Applicant: **Caldwell** Proposed Zoning: **OL**
Location: **SE/c of East 31st Street and South Louisville Avenue**
Date of Hearing: **January 25, 1989**
Presentation to TMAPC by: **Mr. Bud Caldwell, 4606 South Garnett (663-3200)**

Relationship to the Comprehensive Plan:

The District 6 Plan, a part of the Comprehensive Plan for the Tulsa Metropolitan Area, designates the subject property Low Intensity - No specific land use and linear development.

According to the Zoning Matrix the requested OL District "may be found" in accordance with the Plan Map.

Staff Recommendation:

Site Analysis: The subject tract is 1.33 acres in size (150' x 300') and is located at the southeast corner of East 31st Street and South Louisville Avenue. It is partially wooded, flat, contains both vacant property and a single-family dwelling that has been converted to a dentist office, and is zoned RS-3.

Surrounding Area Analysis: The tract is abutted on the north across East 31st Street by a bank facility zoned OL; on the east by the Tulsa Teacher's Credit Union zoned OM, OL and PUD 345; on the south by single-family dwellings zoned RS-3; and on the west across South Louisville by an office and single-family dwellings zoned CS and RS-3.

Zoning and BOA Historical Summary: Office zoning, both OL and OM with a PUD, have been approved in the immediate area of the subject tract. PUD 345 allowed office zoning to a depth equal to the subject application; however, because of the abutting residential development, office use was restricted to the area adjacent to the arterial and limited the southern portion to parking.

Conclusion: Although the requested OL zoning may be found in accordance with the Comprehensive Plan, Staff cannot support OL zoning for the entire tract under application, based on the existing residential development in the area. If approved, two single-family dwellings would front directly into the office use. The orientation of these two residential lots is different from those at the corner of South New Haven Avenue and East 31st Place. Good planning practices do not support fronting residential development into non-residential development without the proper safeguards. Staff is supportive of OL zoning on the north 150 feet to align with the office zoning to the east and west.

Therefore, Staff recommends **APPROVAL** of OL zoning for the north 150 feet and denial of the OL on the balance.

For the record, parking (PK) zoning could be considered on the southern portion of the application under this notice.

Applicant's Comments:

Mr. Bud Caldwell, architect for the Tulsa Teacher's Credit Union, commented that OL zoning was requested to allow a use on the newly acquired property compatible with the existing facility. In reply to Mr. Parmele, Mr. Caldwell stated agreement with the Staff recommendation for PK zoning on the southern portion of the tract with the OL limited to the north 150 feet.

Mr. Carnes moved for approval of OL zoning on the north 150 feet with PK zoning on the balance of the tract as recommended by Staff. Mr. Doherty commented that he had viewed the subject tract, and would be against any motion to rezone the property since as the landscaping/berming conditions of the Credit Union's original PUD had not been adhered to as recommended and approved by the TMAPC. Discussion followed among the Commission members as to the problems with enforcement of the PUD conditions, and possible alternatives for this particular case.

In reply to Ms. Wilson, Mr. Caldwell stated that an OL/PK combination, rather than PK on the entire tract, would offer more flexibility for future needs. Mr. Caldwell advised of discussions with the Tulsa Teachers Credit Union and they were prepared to properly screen the parking area from the RS-3 area abutting the rear of the tract.

Discussion continued on the issue of enforcement of the adjacent PUD's conditions, and the consensus of the TMAPC was to request Staff to follow up with Code Enforcement on landscaping/berming conditions for this PUD.

TMAPC ACTION: 10 members present

On **MOTION** of **CARNES**, the TMAPC voted **9-1-0** (Carnes, Coutant, Draughon, Kempe, Paddock, Parmele, Selph, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; Doherty, "nay"; no "abstentions"; Randle, "absent") to **APPROVE Z-6227 Caldwell** for OL zoning on the north 150' with PK zoning on the balance of the tract, as recommended by Staff.

Legal Description:

OL Zoning: The north 150.0' of a tract described as the west half of Lot 4, Albert Pike Addition to the City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, Oklahoma, with PK zoning on the balance of the tract.

* * * * *

Application No.: **Z-6228 & PUD 179-R Major Amendment** Present Zoning: RM-1
Applicant: **Fox (Quik Trip)** Proposed Zoning: CS
Location: SE/c of East 71st Street & South 92nd East Avenue
Date of Hearing: January 25, 1989
Presentation to TMAPC by: Mr. Pat Fox, 2250 East 73rd (492-4700)

Relationship to the Comprehensive Plan:

The District 18 Plan, a part of the Comprehensive Plan for the Tulsa Metropolitan Area, designates the subject property a Linear Development Area.

According to the Zoning Matrix, the requested CS District is in accordance with the Plan Map if accompanied by a PUD.

Staff Recommendation: Z-6228

Site Analysis: The subject tract is approximately 4.83 acres in size and located at the southeast corner of East 71st Street South and South 92nd East Ave. It is nonwooded, flat, vacant and is zoned RM-1.

Surrounding Area Analysis: The tract is abutted on the north by vacant property zoned RM-1, CS, OL and PUD 235; on the east by a residential retirement center zoned CS; on the south by an apartment complex zoned RM-1 and PUD 179; and on the west by an apartment complex zoned RM-1 and PUD 179.

Conclusion: The proposed CS zoning with the accompanying PUD as amended by Staff is in accordance with the Comprehensive Plan.

Therefore, Staff recommends **APPROVAL** of CS zoning as requested by the applicant.

Staff Recommendation: PUD 179-R

The subject tract contains approximately 10.42 acres and is located at the southeast corner of South 92nd East Avenue and East 71st Street South. The tract has approximately 810' of frontage on 71st Street and 589' on 92nd Avenue. The property is currently vacant and zoned RM-1. There is a concurrent application to rezone the north 270' of the tract to CS. If the zoning request is approved a maximum of 140,140 square feet of nonresidential building floor area could be allowed in the PUD.

The Comprehensive Plan Map for District 18 designates the north 270' of the tract a Linear Development Area, which would allow medium intensity development with an acceptable PUD. The remainder of the tract is designated Low Intensity - No Specific Land Use.

The tract is abutted to the north, across 71st Street by vacant property zoned RM-1, CS, OL and PUD 235; to the west and south by apartment complexes zoned RM-1 and PUD 179 and to the east by a residential retirement center zoned CS.

The applicant's proposal is composed of three development areas:

- Development Area A: Convenience Shopping (.91 acres)
- Development Area B: Retail Shopping (5.35 acres)
- Development Area C: Mini Storage (4.16 acres)

Access to the site is proposed to be by three curb cuts on 71st Street (the center one having a break in the median) and two curb cuts on 92nd Avenue. The applicant is also proposing to completely eliminate a landscaped 20' wide median on 92nd Avenue to allow left hand turns into the development and conversion of 92nd Avenue to a four lane street for 350' before it intersects 71st Street.

After review of PUD 179-R, Staff finds the uses and intensities of uses proposed, with the accompanying CS zoning are in harmony with the spirit and intent of the Code. Based upon the following Staff conditions Staff finds that PUD 179-R is:

- a) consistent with the Comprehensive Plan;
- b) in harmony with the existing and expected development of surrounding areas;
- c) a unified treatment of the development possibilities of the site and;
- d) consistent with the stated purposes and standards of the PUD Chapter of the Zoning Code.

Therefore, Staff recommends **APPROVAL** of PUD 179-R subject to the following conditions:

- 1) That the applicant's Outline Development Plan and Text be made a condition of approval, unless modified herein.

2) **Development Standards**

Development Area A

Site Area	39,807 sf
Building Area	3,200 sf (.08 FAR)
Open Space	5,175 sf (13%)
Building Setbacks:	
North Property Line	50'
West Property Line	50'
Development Area B	1'
Maximum Building Height:	20' (not to exceed 1 story)
Sign(s):	One ground sign with a maximum height of 25' setback at least 110' from the centerline of South 92nd East Avenue
Permitted Uses:	Retail sale of convenience goods, gasoline and automobile lubricants and accessories, not to include the sale or installation of tires or batteries, nor any minor repair or maintenance of vehicles.
Vehicular Access:	One access on 71st Street without a median break and one access on 92nd Street with connection of the parking lots in Development Areas A and B.

Development Area B

Site Area	233,065.66 sf
Building Area	67,589 sf (.29 FAR)
Open Space	25,650 sf (11%)
Building Setbacks:	
North Property Line	50'
West Property Line	50'
Development Area A	0'
Development Area C	0'
Maximum Building Height	28'
Sign(s):	Two ground signs with a maximum height of 25', one as shown in applicant's Exhibit A, and the other set back at least 50' from the east property line of Development Area B.
Permitted Uses:	Use Units 11, 13 and 14, also restaurants

Development Area C

Site Area 179,920 sf
 Building Area 68,363 sf (.38 FAR)
 Open Space 23,400 sf (13%)

Building Setbacks:

East Property Line 11'
 South Property Line 11'
 West Property Line 45'
 Development Area B 1'

Maximum Building Height: 14' (1 story)

Sign(s): One ground sign shall be permitted on 71st Street, placed adjacent to the west property line of Area C, subject to BOA approval. (As amended in this hearing; see TMAPC Review.)

Permitted Uses: Mini-storage

3) Required Screening & Buffering:

All required open space areas on the exterior sides of the PUD shall use in combination or individually landscaping, berms and decorative screening fences with masonry posts to screen parking and storage areas from view from adjacent residences and the arterial street. The minimum width of required open space areas at the property line of each development area is as follows:

<u>Development Area A</u>		<u>Development Area B</u>		<u>Development Area C</u>	
North	10'	North	15'	North	10'
East	0'	East	0'	East	17.5'
South	0'	South	0'	South	11'
West		West	25'	West	45'
	for south 75' - 25'				
	for north 125' - 5'				

The mini-storage in Development Area C shall have a landscaped decorative entrance and be designed so that all openings to buildings and parking and outdoor storage areas are totally screened from view from the adjacent residential areas and arterial street by construction of masonry walls which are finished with materials, such as stucco, rock and brick, which are architecturally compatible with surrounding residential development.

4) That a Detail Landscape Plan for each development area shall be submitted to the TMAPC for review and approval. Landscape architect registered in the State of Oklahoma shall certify that all landscaping and screening fences have been installed in accordance with the approved landscape plan for that development area prior to issuance of an Occupancy Permit. The landscaping materials required under the approved Plan shall be maintained and replaced as needed, as a continuing condition of the granting of an Occupancy Permit.

- 5) That no Building Permits in a development area shall be issued within the PUD until a Detail Site Plan for that development area which includes all buildings and required parking has been submitted to the TMAPC and approved as being in compliance with the approved PUD Development Standards.
- 6) No building permits shall be issued for erection of a sign within a development area of the PUD until a Detail Sign Plan for that development area has been submitted to the TMAPC and approved as being in compliance with the approved PUD Development Standards.
- 7) That no Building Permit shall be issued until the requirements of Section 260 of the Zoning Code has been satisfied and approved by the TMAPC and filed of record in the County Clerk's office, incorporating within the Restrictive Covenants the PUD conditions of approval, making City of Tulsa beneficiary to said Covenants.
- 8) If construction of the buffering and screening required in Development Area C does not occur prior to submittal of a Detail Site Plan for Development Area B, then additional buffering and screening will be required on the south and east sides of Development Area B as a condition of Detail Site Plan approval.
- 9) The Privately Funded Public Improvement (PFPI) to Improve 92nd East Avenue shall be designed and constructed in accordance with the requirements of the Traffic Engineer. (Added at this hearing; see TMAPC Review.)

Applicant's Comments:

Mr. Joe Westervelt, representative for the Quik Trip Corporation, commented the applicant concurred with the Staff recommendation; however, two items he wished to discuss were:

- 1) Since BOA review and approval would be needed for the sign in Area C, he requested TMAPC's approval subject to the BOA review, rather than hold up the TMAPC process.
- 2) In regard to the PFPI for 92nd East Avenue, the applicant volunteered to relocate the existing trees in the median to the adjacent property owners, who originally provided the landscaping in the median. Mr. Westervelt advised of a recent accident where the trees in this median had been run over, and advised the applicant would replace these trees at a new location.

In reply to Mr. Parmele, Mr. Westervelt confirmed the applicant would, at their own expense, widen 92nd East Avenue in accord with the Traffic Engineer's recommendations.

Interested Parties:

Mr. Parmele advised receipt of protest letters from Worthing Management Company, Woodland Homeowners Association and Northhill Corporation (representatives of these groups in attendance and on record as indicated below).

Mr. Richard deJongh (7523 South 85th East Place), President of the Woodland Homeowners Association, Inc., representing 472 property owners located approximately 1/2 mile south of the subject tract. Mr. deJongh reviewed the number of convenience/gas operations and grocery stores in a two mile area from the applicant's site. He requested denial of the rezoning and PUD as he did not feel another convenience store or commercial operation was needed or warranted due to the large number of existing convenience stores and vacant commercial buildings in the areas, and since the site was surrounded by residential developments. He added that additional traffic generated from a commercial operation would also impact the residential areas.

Ms. Sharon Wilson (7209 South 92nd East Avenue), representing Chardonnay Apartments owned by Northhill Corporation, also spoke in protest to the application. Ms. Wilson commented on the number of multi-family and residential dwellings in this area and the impact of additional traffic from a commercial development. She reiterated that another convenience store and/or retail center was unnecessary in the area between Mingo and Memorial on 71st Street. Ms. Wilson stated it was her understanding the City had previously indicated that the subject tract, which fronts the Chardonnay Apartments, would only be used for multifamily development. For these reasons, and the detrimental effect of the proposed development to the livability of the area, she requested denial.

Ms. Linda Fritz (7142 South 92nd East Avenue), represented Worthing Management Company, developers of the Woodland Oaks Apartments. Ms. Fritz advised Worthing also built 92nd East Avenue and dedicated it to the City. She added that Worthing Management installed and maintained the sprinkler system and landscaping in the median on 92nd East Avenue, as they were under the impression that they would retain possession of the median. Ms. Fritz spoke on the quality of residents (age 40 and above) and the standard of living in this area which she felt would be adversely impacted by the proposed development and rezoning. She submitted photos of the landscaped median. Ms. Fritz stated that a convenience store and mini-storage would have a detrimental affect on the property values, curb appeal and the peaceful nature of their apartment community. Therefore, she requested denial of the applications. In reply to Mr. Paddock, Ms. Fritz stated that, even with access restricted to 71st Street, she would be opposed to the mini-storage.

Ms. Margaret Huff (7230 South 92nd East Avenue) advised she was representing Silver Springs Apartments and also Worthing Management. Ms. Huff echoed concerns regarding the negative impact to the curb appeal, property values and quiet atmosphere of their community. Ms. Huff advised she was strongly opposed to access on 92nd East Avenue.

Mr. Bill Wallace, representing Woodland Terrace Retirement Community, commented on the amount of vacant space in the strip center to the east of the subject tract which had a high rate of vandalism. Therefore, he suggested these vacant commercial areas around Woodland Hills be utilized before developing any more commercial. Mr. Wallace repeated concerns regarding additional traffic, noise, etc. from the proposed development. He pointed out that the mini-storage would be visible from the three-story retirement community.

Applicant's Rebuttal:

In reply to Mr. Carnes, Mr. Westervelt advised the exterior surface would be masonry and not any type of metal materials. Mr. Westervelt commented that the Quik Trip Corporation utilized a very sophisticated marketing and research system, which showed there was a need for a convenience store at this location. The studies also indicate residents of multifamily units proved to be some of the most frequent users of convenient stores and mini-storage facilities. He stated that the applicant was working very closely with Traffic Engineering regarding access and the PFPI on 92nd East Avenue and would comply with their recommendations. Mr. Westervelt remarked that the Linear Development Area guidelines were in place when Quik Trip considered purchasing this tract.

In regard to the ownership of the island (median) on 92nd East Avenue, Mr. Westervelt advised that the City was not able to find a license agreement on record. He added that, even with a license agreement, the City could choose to give notice that they would be removing the median for reasons of public safety, development, etc.

In reply to Mr. Doherty, Staff confirmed the parties of record would receive notice of future Detail Site Plans, Landscape Plans, etc. Discussion followed regarding access onto 92nd East Avenue. Mr. Doherty suggested a condition be added to the PUD stating the PFPI would be designed and constructed to the satisfaction of the Traffic Engineer.

In reply to Mr. Paddock regarding the need for access from 92nd East Avenue, Mr. Westervelt explained that, with the median policies of the City, it was far better to move off the corners of arterial street intersections in order to avoid becoming landlocked. Further, some sort of internal circulation was needed for Area B, and they have had requests to limit curb cuts off 71st Streets. Mr. Westervelt remarked the applicant was working with the Traffic Engineer and would be funding a median cut as well as the approaches on 71st Street. He added that, due to the configuration of the convenience store, an access on 92nd was needed.

Mr. Paddock confirmed the entire acreage was under one ownership, and asked if this much acreage was needed for the intended development. Mr. Westervelt explained that the applicant could not purchase just a 200' x 200' tract and had to purchase the entire acreage.

Mr. Westervelt introduced Pat Fox, architect for the project, who advised the access to the mini-storage was limited to 71st Street. Mr. Fox reviewed the proposed landscaping and screening for the mini-storage, pointing out that there would be a 25' heavily landscaped area buffering the apartment community to the west. He stated that Quik Trip has opted for a two-sided building (two fronts) so the development would be "friendly" to the retail development to the rear instead of having a stand alone convenience facility.

TMAPC Review Session:

Mr. Carnes commented that he felt a residentially designed mini-storage was probably the most appealing, low traffic generator that could be placed at this location. He asked Mr. deJongh, as a protestant, if he had any suggestions for making the mini-storage more compatible with the residential areas. Mr. deJongh stated that he did not object to a well designed mini-storage facility or even an office facility, but he was objecting to the convenience store operation and the additional traffic it would produce.

Mr. Doherty remarked that, due to the existing traffic problems, noise, etc. on 71st Street, he could not see this tract as a viable multifamily development. He added this proposal appeared to be an ideal use of a PUD with the buffer of the mini-storage wrapping around the convenience store facility. Mr. Doherty stated concern with the ground sign for Area C, and suggested a condition that "one ground sign may be permitted in Area C on 71st Street, 100' west of the east property line, subject to BOA approval".

Ms. Wilson commented this tract was surrounded by RM-1 uses, and she was not convinced of the need for CS even with the proposed PUD. Mr. Paddock stated he had a problem with these types of applications, even with the Development Guidelines amendments to designate Linear Development Areas. He stated concern with the access on a residential collector street with the commercial development. Except for this, he might be able to support the request, however, as it now stood, he could not vote favorably for the request.

Mr. Parmele commented he felt this application was what was contemplated with the Linear Development Area designation for this particular area along 71st Street was considered. He added that it appears the applicant has met the intent of the medium intensity development area with the PUD proposal. Mr. Parmele pointed out the floor area ratio was rather low for a medium intensity development. He reiterated there was very limited traffic generated by a mini-storage, and the TMAPC did have controls through the PUD for screening, landscaping, etc. to assure proper buffering. Mr. Parmele added that the applicant was offering to improve, at their expense, 92nd East Avenue and access to their property from 71st. For these reasons, he would be voting in favor of the request.

Mr. Doherty moved for approval of the zoning and PUD request with the addition of his previously suggested conditions for the PFPI to the Traffic Engineer's satisfaction, and the ground sign in Area C, subject to BOA approval. Mr. Doherty agreed with Staff's suggestion that, rather than add a condition for the ground sign in Area C, the condition in the Staff recommendation merely be amended to Mr. Doherty's wording.

Ms. Wilson reiterated that she felt the integrity of the residential collector street system was eroded when combined with commercial uses. Further, she did not consider the mini-storage a proper buffer to the abutting multifamily developments. Mr. Paddock commented that CS zoning was appropriate along 71st Street, as it is in accordance with the Development Guidelines. On the other hand, he could agree with Ms. Wilson regarding access from 71st Street as being a critical issue. He commented the PUD was very good and there were a number of features incorporated he liked; however, he could not support the access on a residential collector street to a commercial piece of property.

TMAPC ACTION: 10 members present

On **MOTION** of **DOHERTY**, the TMAPC voted **5-4-1** (Carnes, Doherty, Kempe, Parmele, Woodard, "aye"; Draughon, Paddock, Selph, Wilson, "nay"; Coutant, "abstaining"; Randle, "absent") to **APPROVE Z-6228 & PUD 179-R Fox (Quik Trip)**, as recommended by Staff and as modified for signage in Area C, and addition of condition #9 regarding the PFPI.

Legal Description:

CS Zoning: The north 270' of Lot 1, Block 2, Woodland Springs I Addition to the City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma.

PUD: Lot 1, Block 2, Woodland Springs I Addition to the City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma.

There being no further business, the Chairman declared the meeting adjourned at 3:31 p.m.

Date Approved 2-8-89

DBPaddock
acting Chairman

ATTEST:
Ann C. Coutant
Secretary

